

Report of the Special Committee on the Rules of Procedure.

Motion to consider.

***Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH** (Deputy Speaker and Chairman of the Special Committee).—Sir, I beg to move that the amendments as reported by the Special Committee on the Rules of Procedure be taken into consideration. In doing so, I wish to make a few remarks.

As the report indicates, this Committee was empowered not merely to consider the amendments referred to it, but also other amendments considered necessary by the Committee which were desirable for incorporation in the rules. We accordingly examined the entire body of rules. The most important question which engaged the attention of the members was the provision relating to asking of questions and setting up of certain new Committees. At present a member is entitled to send notice of ten questions for a session irrespective of the duration. For a session of a short duration this means that a very large number of questions will have to come up for answer on the floor of the House. It will not be possible to expect all the questions to be taken up within the question hour. It will also be that the number of questions for which the Government will have to furnish replies will be considerably out of proportion to the duration of the session and therefore bear no relation to the number of questions that would be actually taken up on the floor of the House. At present, notice of all the questions has to be given before the commencement of the session. We felt that members should be permitted to give notice of certain questions during the course of a session also. We have accordingly proposed some changes in the rules. We also considered whether it would not be more appropriate to adopt the procedure prevailing in the Parliament of India and elsewhere according to which each member could send for each day of the session a certain number of questions thus ensuring that the number of questions bore some intimate relation

to the duration of the session. In view of the administrative difficulties involved, we considered it unnecessary to pursue this course of action at present.

Another change suggested is the form of intimation to the Speaker about the arrest of or sentence to imprisonment of a member. At present, these are governed by orders of Government but we have recommended the making of specific provision in the rules.

We have examined the several Committees set up at the Parliament and consider that the setting up of a Business Advisory Committee and a Committee on Government Assurances as very useful.

The Accountant-General had suggested some amendments regarding the functions of the Public Accounts Committee which we have recommended for incorporation in the rules.

In regard to the existing rule for a Library Committee, we feel that the Library is at present working very efficiently under the Chairman and the Speaker and there is no need for a committee of this kind. The present practice of having a Suggestion Book in the Library wherein members could note their suggestions for additions to the Library may be continued. The other changes are of a minor drafting character.

I place this report for the consideration of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the report of the Special Committee on the Rules of Procedure be taken into consideration.”

***Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY** (Chitaldrug).—Sir, the Special Committee that was appointed to go into the question of suggesting some amendments to the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly have made certain recommendations which are welcome and certain recommendations which are not welcome. I will go clause by clause.

We were allowed to table ten questions for every session of the Assembly. The Committee has made certain recommendations that the members of the Assembly may be allowed to table fifteen questions for the Budget Session and eight questions for a non-Budget session. Though the Committee has cut down and rightly the number of questions that the members were entitled to send for any session and have cut down the number from ten to eight to a non-Budget session, the number of days that we were sitting during a non-Budget session justifies this cut. They have made another important provision. All these days, questions that the members wanted to table should be sent before fifteen days of the commencement of the session. Now, they have made a departure that some questions, about ten questions, may be sent fifteen days before the commencement of the Assembly and another five questions may be sent in time before the Assembly meets or during the sittings of the Assembly. This is really a welcome change. For the Budget Session we have nowadays been meeting for a month and a half, two months and sometimes nine weeks. It is desirable that the members should have some right of sending some questions during that period and elicit some answers from the Government.

Another power has been given to the Speaker regarding—whether questions should be sent starred or unstarred and the Speaker can decide whether it should be starred or unstarred according to the importance of the question. This right or this power should not have been granted. I do not like that questions should be classified as starred or unstarred. The members should have a right to elicit information on any question that they table.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—Provided they are in accordance with the rules.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Otherwise questions will not be allowed. When a question is allowed, a member should have a right to elicit any

information that he wants to. We have seen if a satisfactory answer is. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member will also read Rule 25 sub-clause 2, wherein the member has been given the option.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I am objecting even to this. We want information and we want to have a right for all questions and whenever a member feels that satisfactory answer is given, we have seen in practice that many members do not put any supplementary. So, the present practice can easily continue without any difficulty.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member is given an opportunity to make them either starred or unstarred.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Rule 25 reads as follows:

“ 25 (1) A member shall not, unless he has obtained the special permission of the Speaker, be permitted to send notice for a Budget Session of more than 15 questions and for any other session of more than 8 questions.

(2) A member who desires an oral answer to his question shall distinguish it by an asterisk. If he does not distinguish it by an asterisk the question shall be printed on the list of questions for written answer.

(3) (a) For a Budget Session a member may give notice of 5 questions and for any other session of two questions at any time before or during the session, provided that no such questions shall be placed on the list of questions for answer until 12 days have expired from the time when notice of such question has been given to the Secretary.

(b) In respect of the remaining number of questions, namely, 10 for a Budget Session and 6 for any other session, a member shall give notice at least 15 clear days before the commencement of the session at which he desires to put the question.”

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

Regarding the rules governing the tabling of a question, certain provisions have been added here. The present rule is :

“ Subject to the provisions of these rules a question may be asked for the purpose of obtaining information on a matter of public interest.

The right to ask a question is governed by the following conditions :—

(a) it shall relate to single matter ;

(b) it shall be so framed as to be merely a request for information :

.....”

Sri V. M. MASCARENHAS (St. John's Hill).—Sir, why is the Hon'ble Member reading all this. We know all this. He can go ahead with his comments.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Why I read this is—the provisions governing the tabling of a question are wide. Further restrictions to be placed on a member to table a question is not at all desirable or healthy. In sub-rule 2 of the approved rule 26—“for item (i) the following item shall be substituted it shall not be of excessive length.”—That is the wording that is contained in the present Rules of Procedure ; “or in the opinion of the Speaker involve a reply of excessive length.” If this provision is allowed to be passed, I am afraid that the members will be denied a very valuable right to elicit important information regarding a question put before this assembly.

1-30 P.M.

Many a time we have seen and it is in the experience and knowledge of the members of this Assembly, for want of space or for want of information, the answer being very lengthy one, it has not been possible for the Government to place that answer before this Assembly. If this provision is allowed to be passed, then the Government can take shelter under this provision and refuse to answer any question which

requires a lengthy answer. Many a time when a member tables questions regarding the places that the Ministers visited during such and such a period, the purpose of the visit, the number of days toured, the amount that they have claimed etc., naturally government will have to give a lengthy answer and they will say that as it would be a lengthy answer, so it will not be possible to supply that answer. Though it is stated in this rule that ‘in the opinion of the Speaker the question involves a reply of excessive length,’ even that power, I am afraid, should not be invested in the Speaker, because it will be a detriment to the rights of this Assembly.

In item (ii) (g)—

(g) “ It shall not raise questions of policy too large to be dealt with within the limits of an answer to a question ;

(r) it shall not ordinarily seek information on matters of past history ;

(s) it shall not require information set forth in accessible document or in ordinary works of reference ; and

(t) it shall not raise matters under the control of bodies or person not primarily responsible to the Government.”

This is a very very wide power. Many a time the Hon'ble the Chief Minister has given written answers to the questions put by the members of this Assembly “that the questioner may refer to the budget” “that the questioner may refer to certain documents.” If this power is given to the Government, then I am afraid the members of this Assembly will not get any information they want for any question. Whatever the nature of the question is, the Government can easily take shelter under this and say that the information that the member wants to seek is available in such and such document or they may even say that the member may refer to some document placed in the Legislature Library or on the table of the House. Under this clause the Government can refuse to answer questions that the member wants

to elicit. It is highly retrograde and derogatory. I am afraid no member worth the name will allow such a clause to be passed.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—Some of the members of the Opposition Party were on the Committee. They have agreed to these proposals.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Leader of the Opposition and Sri L. Siddappa were on the Committee and they have agreed to that. This has all been done in the interests of the Hon'ble Members. Nobody is willing to cut down the privileges of the Hon'ble Members of this House. But this has been suggested for speedy disposal of questions.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—By applying this short-circuit method, you will be killing the patient, but you will not be reviving him.

“Rule 28-A. If in the opinion of the Speaker any question put down for oral answer is of such a nature that a written reply would be more appropriate, the Speaker may direct that such question be placed on the list of questions for written answer :

Provided that the Speaker may, if he thinks fit, call upon the member who has given notice of a question for oral answer to state in brief his reasons for desiring an oral answer and, after considering the same, may direct that the question be included in the list of questions for written answer.”

I took objection in the beginning alone for this particular power to be invested with the Speaker. I am afraid, this power should not be given to the Speaker and if in the opinion of the Speaker any question he thinks does not deserve a written answer or an oral answer, that question need not be put at all. So, investing the Speaker, with this power whether it should be orally answered or in a written manner, should not be there.

“Provided that the Speaker may, if he thinks fit, call upon the

member who has given notice of a question for oral answer to state in brief his reasons for desiring an oral answer and, after considering the same, may direct that the question be included in the list of questions for written answer.”

I fail to understand how this provision when accepted would be operated upon. I do not know whether the questioner will be called into the Speaker's room or whether he will be asked to explain whether an oral answer is necessary or whether the questioner will be asked on the floor of the Assembly, whether he shall require an oral answer for this. I do not know under the provisions of the Rules of Procedure whether such an argument can take place. We are here to elicit answer and not to adduce evidence or adduce argument before the Speaker, whether such a question should be answered orally or not. This provision should not be there, Sir.

“Sub-rule (3) of rule 31 shall be deleted.” That is the recommendation made by the Committee. Sir, the sub-rule (3) of rule 31 says—

“31 (3). If on a question being called it is not put or the member in whose name it stands is absent, the Speaker, at the request of any member, may direct that the answer to it be given.”

The present clause is a very reasonable and good one. Many a time, important questions would have been tabled by the members of this Assembly and due to some reason or the other, if that member is absent, the right that was given to the members to put that question to elicit information from the Government on that question was given to the members of this Assembly. By deleting this clause that right, is being taken away.

Some time back a ruling was given by the Chair that if an absentee member authorises in writing any other member to put that question which stands in his name, that person who has that authority is allowed to put a question. I am not questioning the ruling of the Chair; even that should

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

not be there. It is not necessary that an absentee member must authorise in writing any other member to put his question which stands in his name. On the other hand the present rule must be allowed free scope.

In rule 34, they have added some new provisos. The question relating to a matter of urgent public importance may be asked with shorter notice than 15 clear days of notice. The proposed amendment runs as follows:—

In rule 34—

(a) In sub-rule (1) for the words "he may admit it with the consent of the Minister concerned", the words "he may provisionally admit the question and direct an enquiry to be made from the Minister concerned if he is in a position to reply and, if so, on what date" shall be substituted.'

This is a very important provision, Sir. Many a time short notice questions were refused to be answered by the Ministers. Now the Ministers, in a way, would be obliged to answer those questions. But it is not perfect. The words "direct an enquiry to be made from the Minister concerned if he is in a position to reply, and if so, on what date" are not perfect. Supposing the Minister concerned is not in a position to reply, then there is no remedy. However this provision is a welcome provision.

Sub-rule (4) shall be renumbered as sub-rule (5) and before the sub-rule as so renumbered the following sub-rule shall be inserted, namely,—

"(4) If the Minister concerned is unable to answer the question at short notice and the Speaker is of the opinion that the question is of sufficient public importance to be orally answered in the House, he may direct the question to be placed as the first question on the list of questions for a day which shall not be earlier than seven days from the date when notice of such question has been given to the Secretary."

This is a very welcome provision, Sir. But one thing. The short notice questions when allowed to be put will be put at the very commencement of the day. If you accept the proposition, the members will have only one hour's question time. The practice was that, after the question hour is over, the short notice questions used to be taken up. Now that right is taken away to some extent.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That right is not taken away. Short notice questions will be treated as short notice questions. But he is obliged to answer.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—What I was driving at is, the time that will be taken for answering this short notice question will be included within that one hour. That is allowed. "If the Minister concerned is unable to answer the question at short notice and the Speaker is of the opinion that the matter is of sufficient public importance and should be orally answered in the House, he may direct the question to be placed as the first question on the list of questions for the day which shall not be earlier than seven days from the date when notice of such question has been given. . . ."

Mr. SPEAKER.—It will be included in the question hour.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—So much so, some of the questions that are put down for the day might lapse. I am glad that we are assured of the right of putting questions, but the right that we were exercising hitherto has been taken away.

Rule 102 runs as follows:—

"Subject to the provisions of these rules, any member may move a resolution relating to any matter of public interest:

Provided that no resolution shall be admissible which does not comply with the following conditions, namely:—"

A number of conditions has been laid down for tabling resolutions.

After rule 102 the following rule shall be added as rule 102-A.—

"102-A. A resolution may be in the form of a declaration of opinion, or recommendation or may be in the form so as to record either approval or disapproval by the House of an act or policy of Government, or convey a message; or commend, urge or request an action; or call attention to a matter or situation for reconsideration by Government or in such other form as the Speaker may consider appropriate."

"(a) it shall be in the form of a declaration of opinion by the Assembly;

(b) it shall be clearly and precisely expressed and shall raise substantially one definite issue;

(c) it shall not relate to a matter which is not the concern of the Government;

(d) it shall not contain arguments, inferences, ironical expressions, or defamatory statements, nor shall it refer to the conduct or character of persons except in their official or public capacity; and

(e) it shall not relate to any matter which is under adjudication by a Court of Law having jurisdiction in any part of India."

There is slight variation. It need not necessarily be in the form of a declaration. It can be in the form of a recommendation or a requisition. So, this wider scope that has been given to us may be accepted.

Under 154-A. "Limitation of debate:

"(a) Whenever the debate on any motion in connection with a Bill or on any other motion becomes unduly protracted the Speaker may, after taking the sense of the House, fix a time limit for the conclusion of discussion on any stage or all stages of the Bill or the motion as the case may be.

"(b) At the appointed hour, in accordance with the time limit fixed for the completion of a particular stage of a Bill or a motion, the Speaker shall, unless the debate is sooner concluded, forthwith put

every question necessary to dispose of all the outstanding matters in connection with that stage of the Bill or the motion."

I am afraid why there is such a need for this 154-A rule to be included in this.

There is another provision. If we accept that provision, it governs the business of the Assembly.

174-A. "Business Advisory Committee.

"(1) A Business Advisory Committee shall be constituted at the commencement of the Assembly, and shall consist of the Speaker, who shall be the Chairman of the Committee and five other members who shall be elected by the Assembly in accordance with the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

"(2) The Committee constituted under sub-rule (1) shall hold office for one year or until a new Committee is constituted whichever is later.

"(3) If the Chairman, for any reason, is unable to preside over any meeting of the Committee, the Committee shall elect a Chairman; provided that if the Deputy Speaker is a member of the Committee, he shall be nominated as the Chairman whichever is later.

"(4) Casual vacancies in the Committee shall be filled by nomination, as soon as possible after they occur, by the Speaker. A person nominated shall hold office till the next session of the Assembly when the vacancy shall be filled up by election."

174-C. "Functions of the Committee.

"(1) It shall be the function of the Committee to recommend the time that should be allocated for the discussion of the stage or stages of such Government Bills and other Government business as the Speaker, in consultation with the Leader of the House, may

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)
direct for being referred to the Committee.

(2) The Committee shall have the power to indicate in the proposed time-table the different hours at which the various stages of the Bill and other Government business shall be completed.

(3) The Committee shall have such other functions as may be assigned to it by the Speaker from time to time."

Here is a Business Advisory Committee constituted out of members of this Assembly. This is a very good practice well in vogue in other Parliaments and which is also in vogue in the Parliament of India and the functions of the Committee are so wide that this Committee can place a time-table before this Assembly regarding the work to be transacted, regarding the stage or stages of any Bill, regarding the time that is required for discussion of the stage or stages of any Bills, in consultation with the Leader of the House. When such a wide power is given to the Business Advisory Committee, I fail to understand why that power should be again given to the Speaker and the Speaker be the Chairman of such a Business Advisory Committee. I see no reason why power under rule 154-A regarding the limitation of debate should be given to the Speaker. I therefore plead that this 154-A should be deleted.

"Report of proceedings" is governed by rule 165 of the present Rules of Procedure:

"The Secretary shall cause to be prepared a full report of the proceedings of the Assembly at each of its meetings, and shall, as soon as practicable, publish it in such form and manner as the Speaker may, from time to time, direct."

"After rule 165, the following rule shall be added:—

"165-A. Expunging of words from debates.

If the Speaker is of opinion that a word or words has or have

been used in debate which is or are defamatory or indecent or unparliamentary or undignified, he may, in his discretion, order such word or words, be expunged from the proceedings of the House."

"165-B. Printing and publication of other document, etc.

(1) The Speaker may authorise printing, publication, distribution or sale of any paper, document or report in connection with the business of the House or any paper, document or report laid on the Table or presented to the House or a Committee thereof.

(2) A paper, document or report printed, published, distributed or sold in pursuance of sub-rule (1) shall be deemed to have been printed, published, distributed or sold under the authority of the House within the meaning of clause (2) of article 194 of the Constitution."

These are all the powers that were used to be exercised by the Speaker. I do not know why a specific reference is made, vesting in the Speaker the power of expunging words which are unparliamentary or undignified. If any member used an unparliamentary word or used an undignified word another member used to take objection to such a word and it was left to the Speaker in his discretion to say whether it was unparliamentary and if so, that word was used to be expunged.

Regarding the question of privilege, present rule 173 governs the procedure.

"(1) Any member of the Assembly may draw attention to a matter of privilege by handing to the Speaker a written motion to that effect.

"(2) A motion on a matter of privilege arising during the sitting of the Assembly is, notwithstanding anything contained in rules 41 and 43, entitled to immediate precedence over all other business.

"(3) A motion on a matter of privilege, not arising during the sitting of the Assembly, may be made after questions and before

the list of business for the day is entered upon. But any such motion should be made at the earliest opportunity.

"(4) If the Speaker holds that the motion involves a *prima facie* case of privilege, the question shall be referred to the Committee of Privileges on a motion made by the Leader of the House or any member to whom he may delegate his functions under this sub-rule.

"(5) After the report of the Committee is presented the Assembly shall take such action thereon as it deems fit."

This Rule is being substituted by the following :

"(1) Any member of the Assembly may draw attention to a matter of privilege by handing to the Speaker a written notice to that effect.

"(2) A complaint on a matter of privilege arising during the sitting of the Assembly, is, notwithstanding anything contained in rules 40 and 43, entitled to immediate precedence over all other business.

"(3) A complaint on a matter of privilege, not arising during the sitting of the Assembly, may be made after questions and before the list of business for the day is entered upon. But any such complaint should be made at the earliest opportunity.

"(4) If the Speaker holds that the complaint involves a *prima facie* case of privilege, the matter shall be referred to the Committee of Privileges on a motion which shall ordinarily be made by the Leader of the House or by any member to whom he may delegate his functions under this sub-rule."

If we accept this clause (4) we will be restricting the power of the House and members of this Assembly. The Leader of the House or any member to whom you may delegate these functions under this sub-rule can make a motion that that matter should be referred to the Committee of Privileges. If we

widen this rule and give scope to any member of the Assembly, whether he has been authorised or delegated by the Leader of the House or not, that will satisfy the needs of the members of the Opposition.

"Committee on Government Assurances.

"174-H. Subject to the provisions of these rules, a Committee on Government Assurances may be constituted to scrutinize the assurances, promises and undertakings, etc., given by Ministers, from time to time, on the floor of the House and to report on—

(a) the extent to which such assurances, promises, undertakings, etc., have been implemented; and

(b) where implemented whether such implementation has taken place within the minimum time necessary for the purpose."

This is a welcome provision. The Committee can scrutinise and can take all such information as is necessary and place it before the Assembly whether the Government have kept up their promises that were solemnly made on the floor of the Assembly and whether they have executed those works that they promised to do within the time that is reasonable. This is a welcome provision which I accept.

Constitution of this Committee 174-I:

"(1) The Committee shall consist of five members, elected by the Assembly in accordance with the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

"(2) The term of office of the members of the Committee shall be one year or until the next committee is constituted whichever is later.

"(3) The Speaker may, if he thinks fit, discharge a member from the Committee, if such member is absent from two or more consecutive sittings thereof, without the permission of the Chairman of the Committee.

"(4) Casual vacancies in the Committee shall be filled by

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.) nomination, as soon as possible after they occur by the Speaker."

I would like to suggest that the Chairman of the Committee constituted under this Rule should invariably be a member from the Opposition, because in regard to the promises made on behalf of the Government, to find out whether they have been executed or not, it will be desirable if a member from the Opposition. . . .

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—This is an important issue you are raising now. You should have tabled an amendment.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I want to restrict the scope. We know that if it is left to election, no member from the Opposition will be made Chairman of this Committee. Under this rule, a specific provision is to be made that a member from the Opposition is made Chairman of this Committee because under some other provision you have made so and so will be Chairman. If that Chairman is there, he may not allow any questions to be put at all. The Chairman may over-rule.

With regard to Constitution of a Library Committee, present rule 176 says:

"(1) A Library Committee may be constituted by the Speaker to consider and advise upon matters connected with the Library of the Assembly.

"(2) The Committee shall consist of the Speaker as Chairman, and six other members of the Assembly to be nominated by him. The Secretary of the Assembly shall be the *Ex-officio* Secretary of the Committee.

"(3) The Committee shall hold office for one year or until the next Committee is appointed, whichever is later."

2 P.M.

The Special Committee says: "Rule 176 shall be deleted."

The Special Committee that was appointed for this purpose has not given any cogent reasons as to why

this Library Committee should be done away with and why these powers should be entrusted to the Speaker or the Chairman. It would be better always to associate the Members of this Assembly with such Committees. Many a time members were elected to this Library Committee and they will naturally be interested in acquiring a large number of interesting books for the Library for the use of the Assembly. So, I do not see any reason why the present rule should not be continued.

Regarding Public Accounts Committee, I would like to point out that here the Public Accounts Committee is a very important committee of the Assembly. In other Parliaments, I understand generally it is the rule that the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee is drawn from the Opposition Benches. I would earnestly urge that the Leader of the Opposition should be made the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. Otherwise the squanderings of the Government. . . .

A MEMBER.—The very existence of the Opposition Party itself is doubtful.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I am not particular about that. The Hon'ble Member was questioning the very existence of the Opposition Party. If there is no Leader of the Opposition Party, at least the Leader of the Major Opposition Group in the Assembly should be made the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. It is here the daily doings of the Government and the way in which moneys are spent either for the good of the country or ill-spent may be thoroughly scrutinised and those matters may be brought before the Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—But there is no amendment to that effect. So, no useful purpose will be served in raising the point now. If you bring an amendment separately, the House may consider it.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I am bringing it to the notice of this House that such an amendment is absolutely necessary and the House should consider whether such an amendment is desirable to be incorporated, if not now, at least at a future date.

* **Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR** (T.-Narasipur).—I rise to place my views on the Report of the Special Committee on the Rules of Procedure. Amongst the Members of the Committee, the Leader of the Opposition and Sri L. Siddappa are there. I whole-heartedly welcome the report. But at the same time I wish to deal with two important rules. One is relating to questions and the other is relating to allotment of time for voting of Grants. Sir, every Member of this House knows that even though 10 questions are allowed to be tabled by them, most of the questions tabled by them are not answered in time and it has not been possible for the Speaker to include them in the agenda during a particular sitting. There is absolutely no meaning in permitting members to give notice of a number of questions when we do not get the answers in time for the questions sent. I think the Committee should have gone into that question in greater detail.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Last time there was shortage of questions. So, we again issued another circular permitting Members to send more questions.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—That is because of the long session. Normally it has come to the notice of every member here that in a normal sitting, all the questions which have been sent for a particular sitting have not been answered. The existing Rule is that if the Government send answers to questions allowed by the Speaker, then the Speaker arranges them in the agenda. There is no provision for the Speaker to demand answers for questions. There is no meaning in having a rule of that type. The Speaker has a lot of provisions to disallow questions. After having sifted them and arranged them and despatched them to Government, the Speaker should have power to demand answers from the Government. I think we can understand that position. A provision should have been made whereby the Speaker should be authorised to demand answers to all the questions sent by him in time. Sir, the practice that is in vogue in the House of Commons and the House of the People can very well be adopted in

respect of tabling of questions in this House. In the House of the People, every Member states the day on which the question tabled by him should be taken and also states the Minister to whom that question is concerned. If that procedure is adopted, we can very well be sure that the question will be taken up. Otherwise, if we do not provide for a provision of that nature, we have no guarantee whether the questions will be taken up at all. Suppose certain questions are very important and the Government feel embarrassed, they may withhold the answers. After the close of the sitting, no doubt the Legislature Secretariat will forward to us answers to those questions that have not been included in the Agenda. But that does not serve the purpose. We are deprived of the right of putting supplementaries. We no doubt get the answers but supplementaries arising out of those answers can never be put because it is not answered on the floor of the House. Therefore, I submit this Committee should have gone into this question at greater length. It is true as the Chairman already remarked that we would have sent amendments to these Rules. I feel, since such amendments have not been sent, this report may be recommitted to the very Committee to consider that aspect and submit a report as early as possible. Sir, I feel, this is a very important thing because what is the use of giving us some opportunity of sending more questions when even the questions sent are not answered and the Government do not send those answers in time? Therefore, no purpose is served by enhancing the number of questions or reducing the period when answers are not furnished in time.

Sir, I deal next with the question of allotment of days for voting of Demands. According to the recommendations of the Committee, 12 days have been allowed. In every Budget session, the Government place before us Demands on 45 items. The number of Demands are 45. Every member is allowed to send cut motions on every Demand. We see in practice that on certain Demands, a number of cut motions as

(SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.)

large as a hundred are sent and on certain other Demands no cut motions are sent at all. As it is, in 10 days it is not possible even to raise discussion on about 15 to 20 Demands. The rest of the Demands are being guillotined. Sir, on an average the House sits for 5 hours, out of which one hour is earmarked for question. Out of the remaining 4 hours, half an hour is taken away by the interval. Out of the remaining $3\frac{1}{2}$ hours during budget discussion 1 to $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours are taken away by the Ministers' replies to the cut motions sent by the Members. So, virtually, we have only two hours allowed on each day for the discussion of Demands. I think the time allotted is absolutely inadequate. I consider Sir, that at least three Demands have to be discussed each day. If each Demand is given a period of at least one hour, 10 to 20 cut motions can easily be moved and replied to. The object of giving power of moving cut motions is to get replies in respect of definite charges made in the cut motions or to get the view-point of the Government on issues raised in those cut motions. You have said yourself many a time that members take away a lot of time in moving cut motions and the Government's time for reply to cut motions is short and thus the very purpose of sending cut motions is lost. If the Members who send cut motions do not get replies from Ministers on the various issues raised in the cut motions, the very purpose of giving us the opportunity of moving a cut motion is defeated. We study the Budget and draft the cut motions as a result of the various provisions in the Budget. The Budget is such a voluminous book and it may not be possible for us to study it even at a short notice. We devote so much of attention and we move cut motions. If they are simply treated as requests or *arikes* or *bedikes* as in the old Assembly, I think, we rather see that provision is not made for moving a cut motion. Once a member is entitled to the privilege of sending cut motions on Demands, those cut motions should be moved and the Government should reply.

There must be enough time for this purpose. Therefore, I feel that fixing up of three Demands for a day would be quite suitable and as regards the apportionment of time between the three Demands may be left to the Speaker. He would certainly take into consideration the number of cut motions moved on those three Demands and give the maximum time for the Demand that has a large number of cut motions. Therefore, I submit these two are vital issues. In fact these are the only opportunities where we could have control over the Government because it is the purse that matters. Cut motions hold the strings. If enough time is not given to draw or pull the strings or loosen them, the purpose of cut motions is not served.

Therefore, I submit, Sir, that these two are very important issues. The report might be retransmitted to the Committee with the direction that it might go into this question and submit a fresh report very early, if possible, within the course of this session.

* Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—Sir, the report of the Special Committee appointed by this House is before us. It is so important a report that when once it is accepted, it binds each and every one of the Hon'ble Members of the House and I therefore submit that every part of the amendments proposed by this particular Committee has to be carefully thought over and carefully examined. I believe that this is the second report of the nature that is being considered by the Legislature of the Mysore State after we were brought under the Constitution of India. This report is very important because it has effected several amendments to several clauses of Rules of Procedure of the Assembly.

The one amendment which the Committee has recommended is that the Hon'ble Speaker is given power to summon the Assembly if he thinks fit to "call a sitting of the House before the date and time to which it has been adjourned or at any time after the House has been adjourned *sine die*." I was anxiously listening to the Hon'ble Member who introduced this

report to this House as to why this particular provision or power was vested with the Speaker. I do not object to the power being given to the Chair. But it would have been better if he had enlightened us as to why this power is necessary and explain the circumstances under which probably the Chair would be obliged to call for a meeting of this House.

Sir, the next important matter which is being affected by the Report is the one that pertains to the speeches and the time limits thereon imposed on the members with respect to the motion made by any one of the members after the Rajpramukh's Address is presented to the joint session of the Legislature. Sir, the time allotted to us as per the Rules of procedure is only limited to a number of days and the old provision contains or mentions the number of days that are being allotted to the House for the discussion of such a motion. Therein also it was specifically provided that no time shall be allotted to the discussion on the matter referred in the Rajpramukh's Address under Article 175 of the Constitution. But now, the amendment of the special committee proposes to limit the time by the Speaker. I believe this would hit hard against the liberty of the members concerned and I repeat that those members who participate in the discussion would generally dwell on. . . .

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—Which recommendation are you referring to?

Sri M. LINGANNA.—The recommendation of the Committee to give power to the Speaker to limit the time of discussion by each member on the Rajpramukh's Address. The Address would contain broad policies of the Government and the intention of the Government in so far as developmental activities of the State are concerned. Secondly, Sir, the members who participate, would be obliged to refer to these broad principles or policies that the Government have incorporated in the Rajpramukh's Address and I believe, often times, the time required for each member who participates in the discussion would be much more than what he would usually take

for discussion in respect of other motions coming before this House. I learn that in the House of Parliament, the number of days that are allotted for the discussion of the King's speech is six days and there they would set apart two days for general discussion and the rest of the days, *i.e.*, four days, would be allotted for the discussion of any broad policy of the Government as requested by the Leader of the Opposition. But here the days that are allotted are only two and the time also if specified would be a hardship to the members concerned. Instead of that, we have given directly or indirectly powers to the Speaker to allot time for discussion on the matters referred to in His Highness the Maharaja's Address under Article 175 (1). But as it is, rule 15, I contend, would be sufficient and the amendment proposed in a way, instead of becoming helpful, would rather hinder the rights of the members to take full and effective participation in the discussion concerned.

Sir, the next matter that is being proposed by the Special Committee to be amended is with regard to the number of questions that the members are allowed to send. No doubt, till now, every Hon'ble Member had a right to send an equal number of questions to each and every one of the sessions, irrespective of the duration of the period of the session concerned.

(Interruption.)

Sir, it is good that the number of questions that are allowed to be sent to the Budget session is more than the number of questions allowed for sessions of shorter duration. But, Sir, the one peculiarity about the recommendation is with regard to the short notice questions. There, the Special Committee has given powers to the Speaker to admit short notice questions, of course, without taking prior consent of the Hon'ble Minister concerned. But when once the question is admitted, the answering of it is being conditioned by the factor whether the Hon'ble Minister is able to give an answer within a short period or within a specified period mentioned in

(SRI M. LINGANNA)
the amendment. Here I entirely disagree with the recommendations of the Special Committee for this reason that the life of parliamentary activity is contained during that very brief and brisk period of the question-hour and it will be reaching the peak point when short notice question is being admitted and answered on the floor of the House. I need not re-state that questions are in a way sharp weapons by means of which the letharginess or otherwise of the Government is being checked by the Hon'ble Members of this House. Sir, a short notice question is much more important than an ordinary starred or unstarred question for the simple reason that it pertains to a matter of public importance and more or less of recent occurrence also. Every one of us knows that it is almost in the nature of an adjournment motion. Therefore if the amendment takes away the effect of that particular aspect of the parliamentary life itself by providing or by giving time to the minister concerned—it is said here :

“ If the Minister concerned is unable to answer the question at short notice and the Speaker is of the opinion that the question is of sufficient public importance to be orally answered in the House, he may direct the question to be placed as the first question on the list of questions for a day which shall not be earlier than seven days from the date when notice of such question has been given to the Secretary.”

So, I believe this amendment is in a way not at all an improved one over the original rule that we had under the Rules of Procedure.

MR. SPEAKER.—Under the original rule, there was no provision to admit the question at all.

SRI M. LINGANNA.—That portion of the amendment we can adopt. But the conditional period within which the Minister is asked to answer will take away the spirit of the question.

MR. SPEAKER.—The original effect is not taken away. Even if the Minister is not obliging, this rule will come

into operation. It is only an improvement.

SRI M. LINGANNA.—Anyway I submit, Sir, that the short notice Question is treated on a different footing altogether. Even the limiting of the period for seven days as is being embodied in the amendment is not at all a necessity. When once the short notice question is admitted and when once the Speaker comes to a decision that it is a matter of public importance and when once it is being printed, it should be almost incumbent on the Hon'ble Minister concerned to provide an answer to the same.

2-30 P.M.

I do understand the contention of the Chairman of the Committee. But I most humbly submit that the answers to the questions by the concerned Ministers will take a longer time than is needed, or to put it in another way, than the Parliamentary practice actually allows. Now I recapitulate the memory of this Hon'ble House that the number of days given for putting short notice questions is very short in the Parliament of England. If questions are tabled in the morning they would be answered the very next day.

SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).—Where did you learn this ?

SRI M. LINGANNA.—I remember a question being asked by a member in Parliament with regard to the help that was sent from the borders of England. The answer was provided within 24 hours by the concerned Minister. Though he had to collect the information from overseas, from Ceylon, from India and Burma and Africa, but yet the answer was furnished at short notice. Here giving more time for answering these short notice questions would be in a way attaching very little importance to the questions. That is the reason why we are moving in this groove.

We are probably falling into these pitfalls. We are attaching very little importance to the questions put by the members. Oftentimes the folly, to certain extent, lies with the members

also. We oftentimes table questions which would require the Government a long time for the collection of the information. But that apart, the general trend of the Government should be to give speedy answers and quick answers within a short period.

From this point of view, I wholeheartedly welcome the suggestions or the amendments made by the Special Committee. When once the short notice question is admitted by the Speaker, there should not be any time-limit specified within which the Minister is called upon to answer. The next day itself the short notice question should be answered; otherwise it will lose its very effect.

Suppose a particular leader of the State undertakes a fast in regard to a particular policy pursued by the Government and a particular member tables a short notice question as to the action taken by the Government in regard to the fast undertaken. In case, time is allowed to answer, the very object of putting a question on that matter would be frustrated.

MR. SPEAKER.—Not in all cases. It is only in extreme cases that remedy is provided. But in most of the cases the Minister will be obliged to reply immediately. Only in respect of extreme cases this procedure would be adopted.

SRI M. LINGANNA.—Of course, when once the Speaker feels that the matter is of urgent public importance, he will admit the short notice question without consulting the concerned Minister. There is no obligation on the Chair to consult the Minister whether he is in a position to answer or not. Even the Chair would be given an opportunity to admit it. But now that anomaly is taken away. The rest of the amendments would take away the effect of the new proposed amendment with reference to the power that is vested with the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER.—But the House is supreme. The House can criticise the Government.

SRI M. LINGANNA.—Anyway, Sir, I submit that at least short notice questions should be treated on a

different footing and the Government should try to answer them within 24 hours. Thereby we would be creating a good precedent so far as the short notice questions are concerned. If the concerned Ministers were to make up their minds to answer them within 24 hours, they could answer them. If we allow the time, then we would be falling into the same good old form of answering.

SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—On a point of information. According to the existing rule even if the Minister agrees to answer a short notice question, the day on which he is prepared to answer is left to the discretion of the Minister. Now the amendment gives an additional power fixing the Minister to a time-limit. And therefore I do not see that any right conferred in the existing rule is taken away by the amendment. On the other hand, an additional privilege is conferred on this House by this amendment.

SRI M. LINGANNA.—My contention is, that the time allowed is too long a period, which ought not to have been seven days; instead, it should have been one day or 24 hours. Why I said that is, that we have to be more alert so far as the short notice questions are concerned and we should not treat them at par with other questions.

With regard to the other amendments, the new provisions that are being added under 146-A which provides in regard to allegation against persons, is rather a too amplified one. Because under the old rules, we have been provided with the manner in which the members should speak under rule 146 wherein it has been specified that certain restrictions are imposed so far as speeches are concerned. Rule 146-B provides that a member should not speak defamatory or unparliamentary words. Now they have amplified that one. I submit that rule 146-B itself would have been sufficient and so far as the allegations or aspersions are concerned, during question time we are being controlled by the Chair. So far as speeches are concerned, rule 146 is

(Sri M. LINGANNA.)

being laid down. There was ample power under (B) itself for the Chair to control any member of this House if he were to indulge in making any allegation or any defamatory or unparliamentary speeches or words. And also an opportunity is given for the Hon'ble Members of this House to raise points of order when a particular member is not speaking in conformity with rule 146. Here, rule 146 being so simple and so crisp, it indirectly has an effect on the members of this House. Every member of this House is expected to listen to and watch the manner in which the speeches are made by other members. Suppose a member is very alert and another is making a speech which is quite contrary to rule 146, then he would, with the aid of the Chair, bring him to order; or even otherwise the Chair is empowered to bring that particular member to order if he indulges in allegations or in making any derogatory speeches.

Here it is provided that if any member were to indulge in allegations of such defamatory or indiscriminatory nature, then it is incumbent on the member concerned to give previous notice. But I believe no member of this House comes into the Hon'ble House with a definite purpose to indulge in defamatory allegations or speeches of indiscriminatory nature. Oftentimes, human nature being what it is, in the usual course of the speech, due to some rubs here and there, probably a word or two of an unparliamentary nature may come out of the mouth of a particular speaker and oftentimes, so far as I have watched and so far as my little experience goes, these defamatory words are uttered at the heat of the moment and they are not words of calculated nature. Therefore, I submit that this observance of the rules while speaking, under rule 146, is not at all a necessity and that too I have to intimate the Speaker that I have come with a definite purpose to make any allegation or indulge in a defamatory speech against a particular person or against a particular member of the Treasury Bench. That, I believe,

is rather binding ourselves too far and that is why it is wisely and in a most tasteful manner provided under rule 146-B. Therefore, I submit that when rule 146-A is not at all a necessity, it may be deleted as well, as ample powers are vested in each member and in the Chair also in regard to such unparliamentary words or defamatory or indiscriminatory speeches.

With regard to limitation of debate, I believe when we analyse this new provision with reference to the functions of the Business Advisory Committee, this becomes almost unnecessary, because the Business Advisory Committee is constituted and vested with certain powers as to the manner in which a particular Bill is to be disposed of. This Committee is also vested with powers to fix time limits for various stages of the Bill. Therefore, this rule 154-A is an unnecessary provision, but therein it may be contended that it provides limitation of debate not only in regard to any Bill but in regard to any other motion also. It may be further contended that if the debate on any motion in regard to a Bill or on any other motion becomes unduly protracted, the Speaker may, after taking the sense of the House, fix a time limit for the conclusion of discussion or the motion, as the case may be, and the intention of this particular provision is also to give a finality to any motion before this House. So far as Bills are concerned, even rule 154-A says that at a particular stage, taking the opinion of the House, the Speaker may close the discussion on the particular motion. But what is done under the "Functions of the Business Advisory Committee" also is there. That particular Committee fixes the time limit for the stage of introduction, for the stage of consideration and for subsequent stages. So the question does not arise of any discussion being protracted in relation to any Bill for that matter, because when once the House fixes a time limit for any Bill and when once a motion is moved by any one of the members of this Committee that the order of the business of the House shall be as per the Business Advisory Committee. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—This rule comes into operation only when the Business Advisory Committee has not fixed the time. All the Bills may not be sent to the Business Advisory Committee for fixation of time.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—Then in that case there was no necessity for this Business Advisory Committee. You should not have the cake and eat it too. The point is whether we should have a Business Advisory Committee and do away with 154-A or whether we should have 154-A and do away with the Business Advisory Committee. Because both are unnecessary. I believe that when this Committee is being constituted and vested with powers to fix the time limit so far as the Bills and other business are concerned, 154-A is a redundancy. Anyway, I submit that 154-A may be deleted in view of the fact that the Business Advisory Committee is being recommended by the Special Committee. It is very good of the Committee to have recommended the Business Advisory Committee, and also the Business Advisory Committee is given full powers with regard to the allocation of time in regard to a Bill before this House.

They are also constituting a Committee on Government Assurances. Of course, till now we were being provided with a printed book wherein the promises made by the concerned Ministers would be printed and the action taken would also be shown. But it is now provided for a Committee on Government Assurances being constituted on the recommendation of the Special Committee. Of course, the Committee is empowered to report to the House and there the matter stops, because there are certain assurances which probably the Government would not have implemented and the member concerned to whom the assurance is given would be hurt and for that matter, there is no remedy that is being suggested by the Special Committee. The Committee is empowered to report on the action taken by the Treasury Bench, but there is no remedy for the assurances which would stand unfulfilled. Therefore, I believe the Com-

mittee would have done well if at least some portion of the day were allotted for discussion on the Report of that particular Committee on Government Assurances. Otherwise, it would be an ordinary course, just like the printed matter that is being given to us by the Treasury Bench. Instead of the Government or the Treasury Bench printing that particular book, now the Committee is asked to go into that particular aspect of the question and report to this House. Therefore, I submit it would have been better if they had provided one hour or half an hour debate over the report of the Committee on Government Assurances. Otherwise, it looks so bald and so ineffective because the Committee that sits over this matter will have to labour a lot and it will have to go into the cause why a particular assurance is not implemented by the Government. Therefore, I submit that it would have been better if some time were to be allotted for discussion on the report of this Committee.

One matter that remains over is about the number of days allotted for grants by the Special Committee. It is within the memory of every one of the Hon'ble Members of this House not once but several times that discussions again and again have taken place in regard to the way in which the House should tackle the cut motions moved or tabled by the Hon'ble Members. I remember that, even during the last budget session, a very detailed discussion took place in regard to the manner in which cut motions should be taken up, in regard to the manner in which grants should be taken up for discussion and with regard to the time to be allotted for each and every Demand that was placed before the Treasury Bench. Then there was no unanimous opinion so far as cut motions were concerned and I remember that the Chair was pleased to make a statement on that particular issue and it was agreed that no cut motions should be moved as and when Demands were moved.

SRI R. CHENNICARAMIAH.—Your observation with regard to cut motions refers to which recommendation?

Sri M. LINGANNA.—It is with reference to amendment of Rule 124 on page 9.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How much more time do you require?

Sri M. LINGANNA.—I require 15 or 20 minutes more.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the House will rise for Lunch and meet at 3-30.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Three of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty-five Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

3-30 P.M.

*Sri M. LINGANNA.—Regarding the recommendations of the Special Committee with regard to the number of days allotted for voting of Demands we know under Rule 124 of the Rules of Procedure, the time hitherto allotted for discussion of voting of Demands was 10 days. But now the Committee has come to a decision and it has amended the Rule 124 and it has given two days more than what is usually given under the original Rules. Sir, probably the one factor which weighed with the Special Committee for enhancing the number of days for discussion on grants was the persistent and insistent opinion of this Honourable House that the number of days allotted was not at all sufficient in relation to the voting of grants. Sir, added to that, I was referring to one more factor which would naturally arise out of discussion over grants, and that is the right of each and every one of the member of this Honourable House to move cut motions in relation to any particular Demand on hand. Sir, every one of us is aware that usually the number of cut motions would be so large that probably not even 5 per cent of them could be discussed as per the provisions and it was felt by the Hon'ble Members that there should be some sort of arrangement so far as the discussion of cut motions or grants is concerned. This is so

important a matter and it is so important a function of this House that the recommendation of the Special Committee has fallen short of the expectation of some of the Hon'b'e Members. Because, personally I feel that the time allotted is too short and secondly I feel that the Committee could have given its thought over the right that is being vested with each and every one of us to move cut motions. From the nature of cut motions that were discussed hitherto, we would gather that all of them or most of them would be in the nature of 'arikes' or local grievances. On the other hand, I feel that the time given to us, i.e., 12 days, is meant for discussing each and every demand in relation to the policies that would be adumbrated under those several heads. So, Sir, if the Committee had thought a little over this matter, probably, they would have allotted much more time than they have now recommended and probably they would have recommended that Rule 126 should be done away with and these 15 days or the number of days that we had suggested would have been of a different manner altogether. From what I have learnt from books, because I was never a member of the Parliament of the United Kingdom nor can I hope to be one, it is a practice there that when discussion takes place in relation to any budgetary matter, they would allot days with reference to particular demands and during those days the discussion would centre round the major policies that the Government was intending to embark upon. I believe that is the best parliamentary procedure that we also should adopt and we could also practice it. Therefore, Sir, I submit that with the retention of clause or Rule 126, the number of days that has been recommended by the Sub-Committee is also interesting. Because Rule 126 gives an opportunity to every one of us to table as many cut motions as are desired. There is no prohibition that a particular member should table only a certain number of cut motions with reference to a particular Demand.

Therefore, if we strictly adhere to Rule 126, the discussion would prolong for more days than probably the Special Committee envisaged. It would take even a month for that matter. If all the cut motions under Rule 126 were to be discussed and if an opportunity were to be given to each and to every member moved to the cut motions, probably even these 12 days would be insufficient. I submit that they could have done away with Rule 126 and that they could have provided a different procedure in consonance with the prevailing parliamentary procedure elsewhere so far as the discussion of grants are concerned. Therefore, I submit, Sir, this particular recommendation of the Special Committee, with reference to Rule 124, though it looks an improvement, has fallen short of the expectations of some of us at least.

Finally, Sir, they have suggested for the doing away with the Library Committee. Probably, the most innocuous Committee that we have ever constituted under the Rules of Procedure is the Library Committee and the functions are also not in any way coming in the way of the day to day functions or administration of the Government. It is only a Committee which will be functioning as a helping hand to the Chair. If we were to do away with this Committee, the Chair as well could function in its place, but I believe the retention of it would not have been in any way a harm to us. Probably the Chair will always nominate such members who are conversant with the latest publications or books about politics or about parliamentary activities or about other literature that would be helpful to the members of the Legislature. Therefore, I am unable to understand how this Special Committee took a fancy for not recommending the continuance of this Library Committee. I therefore suggest that, if it is not too late, the Library Committee should be retained as provided for under the old Rules of Procedure. With these few words I submit—but for some of the shortcomings here and there—that I welcome

all the recommendations of the Special Committee wholeheartedly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We have to apportion the time. Only those points which have not been covered by the Hon'ble Members who have already spoken may be discussed.

*Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY (Mysore South).—I will be very brief in my remarks. At the very outset I am glad to say that the Special Committee appointed to amend the Rules of Procedure have done a good job.

Coming to the amendments proper, I find that Rule 15 is to be amended by substituting a new rule. This new rule is intended to allot time for discussion of the matters referred to in His Highness the Maharaja's Address under Article 175(1) of the Constitution. As it stands, Sir, there is no provision. But I am afraid that under Rule 14 (3), on the motion of thanks, a regular discussion is allowed. Members are allowed to traverse the subject matter of His Highness' Address. When such is the case, Rule 15 would be superfluous or it will be duplicating matters, because matters referred to in His Highness' Address will also be discussed on the Motion of Thanks. So, members who speak on the same matter will be again allowed to repeat or speak on the same matter under Rule 15 which is sought to be amended.

The next thing is: my friend Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy was right when he said that to the restrictions placed on sending questions, some additional restrictions have been put. I take strong objection for the restriction (t), i.e., "it shall not raise matters under the control of bodies or persons not primarily responsible to the Government". Sir, I do not know what reason the Committee Members had to introduce this restriction now. As a matter of fact, Government are ultimately responsible for the control of certain bodies or persons. I would like to know from the Hon'ble the Deputy Speaker whether by this control of bodies or persons he means local bodies or institutions which are quasi-Governmental. Even then, Sir, my humble submission would be that Government having ultimate control, members

(SRI B. NARAYANASWAMY.)
should have a right to put questions and as such, this item (t) may be deleted.

Coming to the question of Rule 28, I have no objection. But I have a strong objection to the deletion of sub-rule (3) of Rule 31. That is the member's privilege. That is a right given to a member. Supposing I have sent a question and I have asked another Hon'ble Member to put that question with the permission of the Chair—that may be a very important question in which every member may be interested. Supposing one member is absent and permission is taken to permit another member to put that question—that right should not be taken away. I would request that sub-rule (3) of Rule 31 should be retained.

Sir, so far as short notice questions are concerned, I am fully in agreement with the members of the Special Committee. But when once a Minister is directed to make an enquiry, but he does not respond, the only alternative left to the Hon'ble Speaker would be to allow the question and direct the Government to answer. But again, I see it is worded like this:

“If the Minister concerned is unable to answer the question at short notice and the Speaker is of the opinion that the question is of sufficient public importance to be orally answered in the House, he may direct the question to be placed as the first question on the list of questions for a day which shall not be earlier than seven days from the date when notice of such question has been given to the Secretary”

Sir, I would like to bring to the notice of the members of the Special Committee and also the members of this Hon'ble House that Rule 34 definitely lays down that no short notice question can be allowed unless it relates to a matter of public importance, and as such, if it is not a matter of public importance, the Speaker has got every right to disallow it. But to say again “that the question is of

sufficient public importance to be orally answered”—this portion would be superfluous. When once the Speaker admits a short notice question of public importance under Rule 34 and when the Minister concerned has not responded to the direction that an enquiry be made, the only alternative left is to include that in the list of business. So this portion of the clause “the Speaker is of the opinion that the question is of sufficient public importance to be orally answered” must be deleted.

Sir, Rule 102-A also is an addition and it is really a very healthy amendment and it is a right that has been conferred on the member. But in the end the wording is very unhappy. It reads “or in such other form as the Speaker may consider appropriate”. The entire right that has been given under 102-A will be taken away by this one clause “in such other form as the Speaker may consider appropriate”. That means to say that it is for the Speaker to decide whether it is in the form of declaration of opinion, “or recommendation or may be in the form so as to record either approval or disapproval by the House of an act or policy of Government, or convey a message; or commend, urge or request an action; or call attention to a matter or situation for reconsideration by Government”. It should stop there. Because that is a substantial right that is given to the Hon'ble Members of this House and there should be no further restriction on that side. So the last sentence “or in such other form as the Speaker may consider appropriate” may kindly be deleted.

So far as cut motions are concerned, I am satisfied with the days allotted.

Sir, coming to Rule 146-A—it is a new rule that has been added. I think that when the Hon'ble Speaker has got every right under Rule 165-A to expunge words from the debate, this new rule will again be superfluous. Because any defamatory or incriminatory allegation made by a member, if objection is taken to, the Hon'ble Speaker would either disallow it or if objection is taken that it should be expunged, it will be expunged. So,

why should there be an additional Rule 146-A? When once the Speaker has got power under 165-A to expunge words in a debate, this additional rule is unnecessary.

Coming to Rule 154, I have strong objection to the same. This is certainly a tremendous restriction placed on the rights of members. It is a right that is conferred on a member to move a motion for closure. By 154-A a power is given to the Hon'ble Speaker to limit the debate. It is for the House to decide whether a particular debate is of an unduly protracted nature and if any Hon'ble Member moves a closure motion, it is for the Speaker to decide. Now under 154-A, limitation of a debate :

"Whenever the debate on any motion in connection with a Bill or on any other motion becomes unduly protracted the Speaker may, after taking the sense of the House, fix a time limit for the conclusion of discussion on any stage or all stage of the Bill or the motion as the case may be."

I think this is a restriction that I will not be happy with.

Sir, I am very glad that the Special Committee has introduced this Business Advisory Committee. It is but right that the Speaker ought to be the Chairman of this Committee. Because it is for the Speaker to regulate the business of the House and he should be in the Committee to know exactly what the Committee has decided. As such my Hon'ble friend Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy, perhaps did not appreciate this point of the Speaker being on this Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—His objection was not with regard to that Committee. It was with regard to the Public Accounts Committee.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—On the Business Advisory Committee, he said

Mr. SPEAKER.—No. He did not object.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—I am sorry, Sir.

4 P.M.

I want the Speaker to be the Chairman.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—I am glad you say that the Speaker should be Chairman of the Business Advisory Committee and there is no meaning in giving that power under Rule 154-A.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—With regard to the Committee on Government Assurance, I feel that this is also an additional right conferred on this House. Even now Government is giving us some report on what actions they have taken on the assurances given by them on the floor of the House. But many a time, we find in report the many minor matters that have been complained of have been complied with. Now this Committee should really go into all these matters and find out whether the Government have really kept up their promises and assurances. More than all, merely presenting this report will not be enough, Sir. This report ought to be discussed on the floor of this House and the opinion of this House has to be taken. Perhaps this can be done. After the report is presented, any member can make a motion that this report may be taken into consideration. As such, I think, on the whole the Special Committee has really done very good service and I congratulate the members of the Committee.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ಸಾಗರ-ಹೊಸ ನಗರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ನಡೆವಳಿಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದು ಪಡಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ರಚಿಸಿದ ವಿಶೇಷ ಸಮಿತಿಯು ಹಲವಾರು ತಿದ್ದು ಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಈ ತಿದ್ದು ಪಡಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊಟ್ಟ ಮೊದಲನೆಯದು (9)ನೆಯ ನಿಯಮಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟು ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಕರೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳೊಳಪಟ್ಟ ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಕರೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಇದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಇಷ್ಟ ಪಟ್ಟರೆ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಯಾವಾಗ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಕರೆಯಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ನಮೂದಿಸಿದೆ. ಇದು ಸ್ವಾಗತಾರ್ಹವಾದದ್ದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಲಿಂಗಣ್ಣ ನವರೇನೋ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಅಗತ್ಯವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—I am sorry I never said that. I quite welcome the suggestion. My only contention was that there will be no such occasion for the Speaker to exercise this power.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಅವರೂ ಈ ಪ್ರಾವೀಷ್ಣಿಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಈಗತಾನೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರು. ಆದರೆ, ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ; ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಮನಗಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಕರೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಆಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಪ್ಪದೆ ಹೋದರೆ, ತಮಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕೆಲಸವಿದೆ, ಪುರಸ್ಕಾರವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ಈಗಿರುವಂತೆ ಏನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಅಷ್ಟೇನೂ ಸಮರ್ಥನೀಯವಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗಿನ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನೇ ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ ಮೀರದಂತೆ ಒಮ್ಮೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಕರೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲವನ್ನೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಕಾಣಬಹುದು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆಯೇ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಕರೆಯಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹುಜನ ಇಷ್ಕುರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಈಗಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರದ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆರು ತಿಂಗಳ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ತಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿವೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಎಲ್ಲ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಕರೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅಗತ್ಯವಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಕ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

15ನೆಯ ರೂಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ 'His Highness the Maharaja's address' ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನೊಂದು verbal amendment (ಅಕ್ಷರಗಳ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ಸೂಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. His Highness the Maharaja ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು, 'His Highness the Rajpramukh or Governor' ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಮೊದಲನಿಂದಲೂ ನಾನು ಇದನ್ನು Notice ಮಾಡಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೆ. ಈಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಒದಗಿರುವಾಗ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. 'Rajpramukh or Governor' ಎಂದು ಎರಡನ್ನೂ ಸೇರಿಸುವುದರ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಮುಂದೆ ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ರಾಜ ಪರಮಭರ ಹುದ್ದೆ ವಜಾ ಆದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಈಗಲೇ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಂತಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಆಮೇಲೆ 25ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು; ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಲಹೆ. ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು 15 ದಿವಸಗಳ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸುಲಭಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಅಭಿವೇಶನಗಳಿಗೂ 10 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬಹುದೆಂದಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಿ, ಬಡ್ಡೆಕ್ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಗಾದರೆ 15 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬಹುದೆಂದೂ, ಬೇರೆ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಗಳಿಗಾದರೆ ಎಂಟು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬಹುದೆಂದೂ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೇಲಾಗಿ ಈ 15 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 10 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ 10 ದಿವಸಗಳ ಮುಂಚಿನ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದೂ ಉಳಿದ ಐದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು, ಸಭೆಯು ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ, ಅಥವಾ ಸಭೆಯು ನಡೆಯು

ತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಯಾವಾಗ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬಹುದೆಂದೂ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಮಿಕ್ಕ ಅಭಿವೇಶನಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆರಕ್ಕೆ ಹತ್ತು ದಿವಸಗಳ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದೂ, ಎರಡಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವಾಗ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಕೊಡಬಹುದೆಂದೂ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಆಮೇಲೆ starred and unstarred questions ಎಂದು ಲೋಕಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಮಾದರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇರಲೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗೀರ ತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗೆ ಯಾವ ಕಷ್ಟವೂ ಕಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೇಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಮುದ್ರಿಸಿ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಉಪಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಹಾಕಬಹುದು, ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಿಡಬಹುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ starred ಮತ್ತು unstarred ಎಂಬ ಭೇದಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಕಾಜು ಅಷ್ಟು ನೂಕುವಾದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಅಗತ್ಯ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಆಮೇಲೆ 26ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ admissibility ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಕೆಲವು conditions ಗಳನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೂ ಕೂಡ ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಉದ್ದದ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೆತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 'It shall not be of excessive length' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಮುಂದೆ Q R ಮತ್ತು S ಹಾಗೂ T ಉಪವಿಧಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕಡ್ಡಿನ restriction ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗೀರಕ್ಕೆ restriction ಗಳಿಂದಲೇ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮೋತಾಮಾದಲ್ಲವು. ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣಬಂದಂತೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಈಗಲೂ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಮೊಟಕುಮಾಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಇನ್ನಷ್ಟು ಇಕ್ಕಟ್ಟುಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ವಮೇಲ್ಯವು ಕಂಡುಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಸೆರೆಸಿರತಕ್ಕ 26ನೆಯ ರೂಲಿನ ಎರಡನೆಯ ಸಮೂಲವನ್ನು delete ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅಗತ್ಯವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಆಮೇಲೆ short notice ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯ. ಈಗಂತೂ ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು short notice ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವ ತಂತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಸಾರಿ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸಾಧನೆಯಾಗದೆ ವಿಫಲರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂಥ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರೂ ಈಗೀರಕ್ಕೆ ರೂಲ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರಂತೆ ಒಂದು typed list ನ್ನು ಬರೆದು ಕಳುಹಿಸಬಹುದು. ಒಂದೆರಡು ಸಾರಿ ಹೀಗಾದ್ದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದಮೇಲೆ, ಈ ಪ್ರಾವೀಷ್ಣು ಇರುವುದರಲ್ಲಾ ನಾಮಕಾಪಾಸೆಯಾಗಿಯೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿ ಆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟೇಬಿಟ್ಟಿವು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಏಳು ದಿವಸ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಟ್ಟು, ಆಮೇಲೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಇಷ್ಟಪಡದಿರಲಿ ಅವರು ಉತ್ತರಕೊಟ್ಟೇ ತೀರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವುದು ಅತ್ಯಂತ ವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು vote of Demands and Grants ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಇದ್ದ 10 ದಿವಸಗಳ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು 12 ದಿವಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಏರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಇಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಶೇಷ ಹಕ್ಕುಭಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ಹೊಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು. ಇತರ ಸಭೆಗಳಿಗೆ, ಸಮಿತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಂಥ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇದಕ್ಕಿದೆ. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಣದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಗಮನಕೊಟ್ಟು ಬರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಿಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಎಷ್ಟು, ಅದು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಹಣದಮೇಲೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಹಕ್ಕೋಟಿಯಿರುವುದು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ. ಮೇಲಾಗಿ ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮೊದಲು ಇದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಮೊದಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳು Law and Order ನೋಡಿ ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಕಾಗಿತ್ತು; ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಯಂತ್ರವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋದರೆ ಸಾಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಹಾಗಲ್ಲ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೋದ್ಯಮಗಳಿಗೆ ಆರು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೋದ ಸಾರಿ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಡಿಮಾಂಡ್ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ನನಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವೇ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು 'Aye' or 'Nay' ಎಂದು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಂತು. ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಐದು ಘಂಟೆಯಾಯಿತೆಂದು 'ಗಿರೋಟಿಕ್' ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಚಲಾಯಿಸಿ ಗಿರೋಟಿಕ್ ಮಾಡಿಬಿಟ್ಟರು. ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೀ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ನಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರೂ 30-40 ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳ ಮೇಲೆಯೇ ಒಂದು ದಿವಸ, ಎರಡು ದಿವಸ ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕ ನ್ಯೂನತೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಬೇಕಾದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು, marketing ಮುಂತಾಗಿ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಇದ್ದೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಲ್ಲಿ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಯಾವುದರಮೇಲೆಯೂ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವೇ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ (ಒಳಾಡಳಿತ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಆಡಳಿತ ಕಮಿಟಿ, ಎಸ್ಸಿಮೇಲ್ಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಮುಂತಾದುವುಗಳೂ ಇವೆ ಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೋಗಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಕಮಿಟಿಗಳು ಇವೆ ನಿಜ. ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಕಂಡುಕೊಂಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಅವು. ಆದರೆ ಅವು ಸಭೆಯ ಹೊರಗಡೆಯ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವು. ಅವೇ ನಿಧರಣ ತಮ್ಮ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಡುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗಾದರೋ ಅವುಗಳ ಕಡೆ ಗಮನಕೊಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ, ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯು ಏನಿದ್ದರೂ ಹಣವು ಬರ್ಚಾದುದರಮೇಲೆ ತನ್ನ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತದೆ ಅಷ್ಟೆ.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—What about Estimates Committee? They go into it in greater detail.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು clarification ಕೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಎಸ್ಸಿಮೇಲ್ಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳದೇಯೆ budgetary provision ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—What I said was: there are effective checks and safeguards.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—12 ದಿವಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಡಮೆಯಿಲ್ಲದಂತೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಅನುಭವದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದನ್ನೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ 10 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾರಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ '10 ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾರಿದಂತೆ' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆಯೆಂದು ನಾವುಗಳಾರೂ ಎಂದೂ ಹನ್ನೊಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರೂ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೊಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವುದಾದರೂ ನಾವು ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೆಯೂ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾದ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಆಸಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ವಹಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಾರಣ ಮತ್ತು ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೆಂಬ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಉಚಿತ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಒದಗಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಬರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯುತವಾದಂಥ ವಿಷಯ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅವರ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ. ಇಂಥ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಒಂದೆರಡು ದಿವಸಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಯಾರೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದನ್ನು ಅನ್ಯಥಾ ಭಾವಿಸಲಾರರೆಂದು ನಾನು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಲು, ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಎಂದು ಆಸಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನುಂಟು ಮಾಡಲು 2-3 ದಿವಸಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಈಗ ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ 12 ದಿವಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ 15 ದಿವಸಗಳಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಪಕ್ಷ 15 ದಿವಸಗಳಿರುವಂತೆಯಾದರೂ ಇದನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಧರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಈ ಅಪ್ರೋಪ್ರಿಯೇಟಿವ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್, ಕಂಟ್ರೋಲರ್ ಮತ್ತು ಆಡಳಿತ ಜನರಲ್ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ವರದಿ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಕ್ಯಾಜನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಸ್ವಾಗತಾರ್ಹವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಈ ಅಂಗೀಕರಣಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ:

Rule 146.

"Rules to be observed while speaking."

ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ನಿರ್ಬಂಧಗಳಿವೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಂತಸ್ತೇನು, ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರಬೇಕು, ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಮಾತುಗಳು ಯಾವ ಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿರಬೇಕು, ಎನ್ನುತ್ತಾ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅನುಸರಿಯೇ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಆಸೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.)

ರಿಗೂ ಇದ್ದೇ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಏನೋ ಪ್ರಸಂಗವಶಾತ್ ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಬಂದಿದರೆ—ಹಾಗೆ ಪ್ರವೋಕ್ ಅಂಥ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವಂಥ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಶಬ್ದಗಳು ಬರಬಹುದೇ ಶಿವಾಯಿ ಯಾರೂ ಹಾಗೆ ಉದ್ದೇಶಪಟ್ಟು ಇಷ್ಟಪಟ್ಟು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಯಾರೂ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಲಿಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಅವರು ನೂಟಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ, ಅವರೇನು ಒಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದು, ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆಯೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಯನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದಕಾರೂ ಇದರ ಅಗತ್ಯವೇನೂ ಅಪ್ಪಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ; ಆದರೆ ಈ ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಯಾವುದೋ ಕೆಲವು ಘಟನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಇದನ್ನು ಬರೆದಿರುವಂತೆ ಭಾಸವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

“No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker. . . .”

ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಯಾವ ತರಹ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ನಾನು ಇಂಥ ದಿವಸವೇ ಇಂಥವರನ್ನೇ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಬಯ್ಯುತ್ತೇನೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಇಂಥವರನ್ನೇ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ರೂಢಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವುದು “ನೀನು ಸಭೆಯಿಂದ ಎದ್ದು ಹೊರಗಡೆಗೆ ಬಾ. ಆಗ ನಾನು ನಿನ್ನನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ” ಎಂದು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ “ನೀನು ಹೊರಗಡೆಯಿಂದ ಸಭೆಯೊಳಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾ. ಆಗ ನಿನ್ನನ್ನು ನಾನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ” ಎಂದು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ನೀವು ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ಅಫೀಸರ್ ಲಂಚ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಹಾಗೆ ನೀವು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಆಪಾದನೆ ನಿಜವಾದುದೇ ಅಥವಾ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದನ್ನು ಡಿಫೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಆಪಾದಿತರು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

They will be armed to give you a reply.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಅಂಥಾದ್ದು ಹೊಸದೇನೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. In case of such a debate ಅದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲ ಬೇರೆ ವಿಧಿಗಳಿವೆ. ಆದರೂ ಯಾರೂ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಬೇಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಿಂದ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಮಾಡುವುದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೂ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ರುಜುವಾತು ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ಬದ್ಧರಾಗಿರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಒಂದು ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಈಗ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದೂ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಅರ್ಥವೂ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದೂ ಹೇಳಲಿಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಾಗೊಂದುವೇಳೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಅಂಥ ಅಲಗೇಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅವರು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ರುಜುವಾತು ಮಾಡಲು ಸಿದ್ಧರಾಗಿಯೇ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಹೊಸ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಹೊರಗಡೆಯಿರತಕ್ಕವರನ್ನು ಆಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ಹಾಗೊಂದುವೇಳೆ ಯಾರ ಮೇಲಾದರೂ ಖಚಿತವಾದಂಥ ಆಪಾದನೆಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಂಥವರ ಮೇಲೂ ಮತ್ತು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಇಲಾಖೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಲಂಚ ಕೋರತನ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರತಕ್ಕ ಹಕ್ಕು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಇದ್ದೇ ಇದೆ. 154-Aನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಈ ವಿಧಿಯನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಲು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ:

“Whenever the debate on any motion in connection with a Bill or on any other motion becomes unduly protracted the Speaker may, after taking the sense of the House, fix a time limit for the conclusion of discussion on any stage or all stages of the Bill or the motion as the case may be.”

ಹೀಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ನಾವು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸುವುದಾದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ಮನೂಫ್‌ಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಳಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಖೋತಾ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ ಬರಬಹುದು. ಇಂಥಂಥ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಇಷ್ಟೇ ದಿವಸಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧವೂ ಬರಬಹುದು. ಅನೇಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನೇ ಕೊಡದಿರಬಹುದು.

ಈಗ ಹಾಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲೇ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಧಿತಗೊಳಿಸಲು ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವರು ಕೆಲಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ನಾಯಕರನ್ನೂ ಮತ್ತು ಎದುರು ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರನ್ನೂ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕರಾಪಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸುಗಮವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಲು ಅನೇಕ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಗಳು ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಹಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರತಿಬಂಧಕ ಹಾಕಲು ಯತ್ನಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿದನಂತರ ತಾವು ನಾವು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಲಹೆ ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಬೇರೆಯಲ್ಲದ್ದಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಅದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಬಹುದು. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಈಗ ಕೆಲವು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಖೂರಿಂಗ್ ಅನವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗ ಆ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲು ಅದರ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿದೆಯೇ, ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಚರ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕಾದಂಥ ಪ್ರಸಂಗಗಳು ಬರಬಹುದು. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಸೂಕ್ತವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪಂಡ್ ಮಾಡುವ ವಿಷಯ. ಇನ್ನೂ ಮೊನೆತಾನೆ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಯ ವಾದ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನೋ ಅಥವಾ ಪದವನ್ನೋ ಎತ್ತಬೇಕಾದಂಥ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಹೊರಬಿದ್ದಾಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾಧ್ಯಸ್ಥ

ರಾಗತಕ್ಕವರು ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಹೋದಾಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅವಮಾನವಾಗುವುದಾಗಿದೆರೆ ಆಗ ಅಂಥ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ನಡೆವಳಿಕೆಗಳ ವರದಿಯಿಂದ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬಹುದೆಂದು ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ರೂಲಿನಲ್ಲೇ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಈ ವಿಷಯವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಆದಿದ್ದಾಗಿ ಮುಗಿದು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಮನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಎದ್ದುಹೋದಮೇಲೆ, ಏನಾದರೂ ಅಂಥ ಅವಮಾನಕರವಾಗತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಕಂಡುಬಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

“If the Speaker is of opinion that a word or words has or have been used in debate which is or are defamatory or indecent or unparliamentary or undignified he may, in his discretion, order such word or words be expunged from the proceedings of the House.”

ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದಂಥ ಸಭೆಯ ನಡೆವಳಿಕೆಗಳು ಬೇರೆ ಇನ್ನಾವ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ಇದ್ದಂತೆ ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇಂಥ ಸಭೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗತಕ್ಕ ನಡೆವಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾರೂ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿದರೆ ಅವರು ಕೆಲವು ಮುಖ್ಯ ವಾಕ್ಯಗಳನ್ನೇ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಮಾಡಿಬಿಡಬಹುದು—ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಿ ಬಿಡಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ವಿಷಯ ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಕಠಿಣವಾಗಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಕಂಡುಬಂದರೂ ಅದು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ತಕ್ಕವರ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸತ್ಯವಾದುದೆಂದೇ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಕೆಲವು ವೇಳೆ ಆ ಸತ್ಯ ಬಹಳ ಕಠೋರವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಕೆಲವು ಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆನು ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಕೇಳಬಹುದು. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ದಿನ ಬೆಳಗಾದರೆ ಈ ಒಂದು ಕೆಲಸವೇ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಬಿಡಬಹುದು. ಇಂಥಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರೆಲ್ಲ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನು ಭೇಟಿಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಶಬ್ದ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಆ ಶಬ್ದ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಸುಪಡಿಸಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಅಂಥ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪಂಜ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅನ್ನುವ ಶಬ್ದವೇ ಹೊರಗೆ ಬಾರದೆ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಏತಕ್ಕಂದರೆ ಹೇಗೂ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪಂಜ್‌ಮಾಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ ಈಗ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಇದ್ದು ಅನಂತರ ಆ ಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆಸಿಹಾಕೋಣ ಎಂದು ಸುಮ್ಮನಿದ್ದರೂ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಅಥವಾ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಾವುಗಳು ಸುಮ್ಮನಿದ್ದರೂ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಆದಿದ್ದು ಪೂರೈಸಿದನಂತರ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅದನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಮಾಡಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಕೆಲವು ಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ವ್ಯಥಾ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಇನ್ನ ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಸಮಿತಿಗಳನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ನಿಯಮಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ—

“Committee on Government Assurances”, “Business Advisory Committee”, “Finance

Committee”, “Public Accounts Committee”.

ಹೀಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಈ ಮೂರೂ ಸ್ಯಾಂಟಾರ್ಹವಾದಂಥ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳಾಗಿವೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

ಇನ್ನು ಈ 17ನೆಯ ಛಾಪರ್ ಒಂದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು. ಹೋದವರ್ಷ ನಾನೇ ಅರನ್ನಾಗಿದ್ದೆ. ಆಗೇ ಆ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಬಹುಶಃ ಪೊಲೀಸಿನವರು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಏನೋ; ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನೇನೂ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿದ್ದು ನನಗೆ ಕಂಡುಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ವೆಂಕಟಪ್ಪ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ನೀವು ಜೈಲಿ ನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಯಿತು ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲ ಅನ್ನುವುದು ನಿಮಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಯಿತು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಜೈಲಿನೊಳಗಿದ್ದಾಗಲೂ ಮತ್ತು ಜೈಲಿನಿಂದ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಬಂದಾಗಲೂ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಆ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪೊಲೀಸಿನವರು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾದದ್ದು ಆಗತ್ಯ. ಇಂಥ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಜಮಾಖರ್ಚು ಇಡಬೇಕು. ಇದೊಂದು ಹೊಸ ಅಧ್ಯಾಯ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕವರು ಅಕಸ್ಮಾತ್ತಾಗಿ ಜೈಲಿಗೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಅವರ ಸಮಾಚಾರವನ್ನು ಈಗ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲು ಇದರಿಂದ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಅನುಮಾನಗಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪರಿಹಾರಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಅನುಮಾನಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪರಿಹರಿಸಿದನಂತರ ಅವುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುವುದು ನೂಕುವಾದುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

4-30 P.M.

Sri P. R. RAMAIA (Basavana-gudi).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, in general, I welcome the report of the Special Committee on the Rules of Procedure. This report is a considerable improvement upon the present set of rules. There are a few points which I would like the Deputy Speaker to enlighten me. Regarding Rule No. 26, there are already several restrictions placed upon the questions being put in the Assembly. Sir, the Parliamentary rights of Members of this Assembly are very wide. The members have to represent the opinion of their constituencies. In doing so, they have to elicit information regarding various points. Already, there are restrictions and these four more restrictions are of such a nature as to prevent the Members from ascertaining information about

(Sri P. R. RAMAIIYA.)

vital points. Sir, now in sub-rule (2) of Rule 26, item (i) says:

"It shall not be of excessive length or in the opinion of the Speaker involve a reply of excessive length."

I can understand the former portion, i.e., 'it shall not be of excessive length.' But I do not understand how under this provision you can include 'or in the opinion of the Speaker involve a reply of excessive length'. Sir, this is an unnecessary curtailment of the liberty of Members to put a question. It involves the Speaker's opinion about excessive length. It is a matter which puts unnecessary strain on the Speaker and it also correspondingly involves a curtailment of the liberty of members. I therefore request the Deputy Speaker to enlighten me as to the necessity of this latter portion, i.e., 'or in the opinion of the Speaker involve a reply of excessive length'. Of course, I have not proposed any amendment and it is open to the Deputy Speaker himself to delete that portion for the convenience of this House.

Now, Sir, in item (iii), 'q' reads thus:

"(q) it shall not raise questions of policy too large to be dealt with within the limits of an answer to a question ;"

Sir, it is a point of debate, whether it raises a question of policy too large to be dealt with within the limits of an answer to a question. It is a matter of debate and as I mentioned with reference to item (i) earlier, this also puts a strain upon the Speaker and it also curtails the liberty of a Member. When once the question is allowed and a reply is given, it is open to the Speaker to limit the supplementary questions with reference to the time, and with reference to the subject also. Therefore, I think 'q' is unnecessary.

Item 'r' says:

"It shall not ordinarily seek information on matters of past history;"

I do not know what was in the mind of the members who recommended this particular provision. Why should we not ask questions about matters of past history? Why should not the Government supply the information? We come here to do our duty and the Government should assist us in giving us information. They may, if they choose, say '*vide* such and such a thing.' But why you should restrict the putting of the question itself, I do not understand. Therefore I would like the Deputy Speaker to revise his view with regard to this matter.

Item 's' states:

"It shall not require information set forth in accessible documents or in ordinary works of reference."

This also is too wide. What are those accessible documents? They may be administrative reports and such other documents. When a question is we want the latest information and put, not what is published in an old document. Moreover, there may be some documents which are not readily accessible. After all, these questions are put to elicit information and the Government are there to help members to get access to that information, and therefore I think this restriction also is unnecessary. What are those ordinary works of reference? They may place them on the Table. In their reply they may say '*vide* such and such a reference'. So, I feel this restriction will not be helpful.

Item 't' says:

"It shall not raise matters under the control of bodies or persons not primarily responsible to the Government."

Sir, the scope of this is very wide. What are the bodies or persons not primarily responsible to the Government? If we take municipalities or

anybody who gets Government grant, they are not primarily responsible to the Government. But we certainly like to know what is happening there and we would like to get some definite information. This restriction is also unnecessary.

Now, Sir, in the Old Rules, 26 (2) (j) says:

"It shall not relate to a matter which is not the concern of the Government."

There it is implied that questions cannot be put on a matter which is not the concern of the Government. So old rule 'j' is enough. Why add one more provision? This is a point which requires consideration at the hands of the Deputy Speaker.

Sir, the scope of the Members of the Assembly to elicit information should not be limited except under special circumstances which are governed by alternative law. But with regard to other things, I think it is very necessary that there should be freedom for Members to put questions. The Speaker has got discretion and he may disallow. So, Sir, the new restrictions proposed have to be removed.

Regarding the remaining portions of the recommendations, I think they are very liberal, especially in regard to the allotting of two more days for discussion of cut motions, *i.e.*, 12 days. It is very liberal and I do not think it is necessary to extend it to 15 or 16 days. But regarding general discussion on the Budget, I wish this Committee had thrown some light. Now, I think, the time allotted for general discussion on the Budget must be extended by one more day at least. Our experience has been that the time allotted for budget discussion is not enough. I therefore suggest that one more day may be allotted for the general discussion on the Budget.

Sir, there is one other point regarding sub-rule (3) of Rule 31. It says:

"If on a question being called it is not put or the member in whose name it stands is absent, the Speaker, at the request of any member, may direct that the answer to it be given."

This rule has been deleted. I do not know what prompted this Committee to delete this rule. It is a very important right enjoyed by the Member and supposing one member is absent, another member may put it and supplementaries asked upon that. Now by deleting that, what happens is that question is not at all put. Of course, it may be printed in the proceedings. The reason given in the Committee's Report is that since printed answers are being given to members before they are taken up on the floor of the Assembly, this rule becomes unnecessary and they have therefore proposed that it should be deleted. But it is not enough that printed answers are supplied. When a question is put, the Members have a right to put supplementaries. Therefore, it is not correct that this sub-rule (3) of Rule 31 should be deleted. It should be retained.

Now, Sir, 165-A—expunging of words from debates:

"If the Speaker is of opinion that a word or words has or have been used in debate which is or are defamatory or indecent, or unparliamentary or undignified, he may, in his discretion, order such word or words be expunged from the proceedings of the House, etc."

No doubt the Speaker has the right. But there may be occasions when it is necessary to have a debate the House as to whether a word is unparliamentary, indecent and defamatory. When a case is pending in the court, it becomes defamatory. But whether a word is "unparliamentary" or not, a matter on which the House has a right to express its opinion. Therefore whether a particular word or expression is parliamentary or unparliamentary, I think freedom should be given to the House to discuss that point. This is all I have to say.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajpet).—Sir, Chapter 17 deals with the member who has been arrested and the Speaker to be informed about his arrest, etc. In 181-A and 181-B only when a member of this

(SRI R. ANANTARAMAN.)

Hon'ble House has been arrested and kept in custody, the persons arresting him and keeping him in custody will have to inform the Hon'ble Speaker about the internment. But it would have been better if the particular person is automatically released on bail so that he may attend the proceedings of this House. Unless he has committed a very serious offence such as murder, ordinarily a member should not be prevented from attending the session and it would not be doing justice to the persons who have elected him. It would be better that the Magistrate himself releases him on bail and makes him attend the session. That is a suggestion I make to the Deputy Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now Sri Chennigaramiah will reply.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾಯ್ಯ (ನಂಜನಗೂಡು)—ಅನು ಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿಗಳು.—ಇದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕರಾಪಕಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯ; ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು ಮತ್ತು ಶಾಶ್ವತವಾದುದು ಆಗುವುದರಿಂದ ದಯೆಯಿಟ್ಟು ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾಳೆ ಕೂಡ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. The consideration motion may be prolonged and the discussion may be continued tomorrow also.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಮೆಕ್ಕಟಪ್ಪ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾಳೆಯೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ವರದಿಯ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಸವಸ್ಥರಿಗೆ ಹಂಚಿದರು. ನಾವು ಕೆಲವರು ಅಮೆಂಡ್ ಬಂದವು. ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಯೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಕೆಲವು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆವು, ಈಗ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕವಕಾಶವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ನಾಳೆ ಕೂಡ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಲು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಉತ್ತಮ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಚಿಂತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—I agree to the suggestions made by Sri Madiah and Sri Venkatappa. It is really necessary that we should discuss this report threadbare because the rights and privileges of Members of the House are under question. It is better that a fuller debate be held and members allowed to send in amendments tomorrow. Therefore discussion over this report may be continued tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Why did not members send in amendments? This was scheduled to be taken up today.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—I do not want to come in the way of Hon'ble Members. But what I say is there is no opposition to this report. All Hon'ble Members have generally welcomed this report. My suggestion is—we may accept this report and then reconstitute the Rules Committee to consider the valuable suggestions made by the Hon'ble Members in the course of their speeches. We can only clarify certain matters at this stage, but we cannot take up fresh subjects and discuss them unless there are definite amendments tabled by members. Valuable suggestions have been made and we can certainly refer them to the Rules Committee.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾಯ್ಯ.—ವಾಸ್ತವವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ನಾನು ಇನ್ನೂ ಈ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಓದಿಲ್ಲ. I want also to offer my remarks and am very anxious to offer the same. I request that the discussion may be continued tomorrow also.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—There is provision in the Rules of Procedure for retransmitting the report to the Rules Committee. I have given notice of a motion that this report may be retransmitted to the same Committee to propose amendments bearing in mind the views expressed by the Hon'ble Members in the course of the debate today. If that motion is accepted, the Rules Committee might incorporate all the amendments that are required to accommodate the views expressed by the Members of this House and then place their report once again before this House so that we will have another chance of debating.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—By doing so we must remember that if the valuable recommendations made in this report are not accepted in this session, this House will be deprived of making use of those facilities. For example, there is the recommendation on the Short Notice question. Unless the consent of the Minister is obtained it is not being taken up now. But if the report is accepted by the House, members will have the right of getting their short notice questions answered.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This Committee will not function just like a Selcet

Committee. Unless there are specific amendments, we will not be able to form a committee. Only after the amendments are sent a special committee will be formed again. The same committee or a different committee may be constituted to go into the amendments. This Committee was constituted long back and the revision of rules of procedure was being considered for quite a long time. We have not been able to effectively bring into force these provisions on account of the continued sittings of this Committee. Suppose it is sent back, it may not be possible to bring up the revised Rules of Procedure within the next Budget Session. Therefore, the effective provisions which may enable the Hon'ble Members to put more questions or send in short notice questions cannot be made use of either in this session or the next.

*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molalkalmuru).—Sir, I do not agree with the Hon'ble Mover of this Report. For the sake of a few facilities that we may have for this or the next session, should we lose for ever the benefits of the valuable suggestions to be incorporated in these rules? Therefore, we would rather lose the advantage for one session than lose the advantage for ever. Secondly, I do not also agree with my Hon'ble friend Sri Srinivasa Iyengar. Because sending it back to the same Rules Committee may not be of use because, the Committee has already given a unanimous report and it may not go back on its own report. Therefore it is necessary that amendments are allowed to be sent and further discussion continued tomorrow. In the light of the discussions and in the light of the amendments, later on you may be pleased to add some more members to the Special Committee. Those effective suggestions that have been made may be considered by the Committee. If this House so desires, they may accept the amendments tomorrow. In a way it is better if discussion is continued. It is also better that amendments are placed before the House tomorrow. That is my opinion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎ. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ (ಕುಣಿಗಲ್).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಾಜಿ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಪೆಂಕಟಪ್ಪನವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಲು ನಾಳೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ನಾಳೆಯೂ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have no objection to continue the debate, but we have to reconstitute a committee for considering the amendments. That could be done only after fresh amendments are received from members. The present Committee ceases to function since it has already presented its report. We have not yet known the fate of the amendments made by the Special Committee. For the last three or four years the amendments to the same rules are being discussed and it is only now that an agreed solution is placed before us. I will leave the matter to the House for its consideration, whether it would be advantageous to pass now and then these amendments, allow members to give notice of fresh amendment which could be referred to the reconstituted committee. I leave it to the Hon'ble Members to think over the matter.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—In view of the suggestions made by the several Hon'ble Members, is it not an agreed solution, Sir? If it was an agreed solution, there would not have been so much debate at all. We are not preventing the future committee or the same Committee from reconsidering the amendments that would be made by the members. Every member wants to speak on this Report and this Report would be the basis on which we will have to proceed further. No hurried discussion should go on in view of the voluminous criticisms made. It is better that amendments are allowed so that you may consider later, how and in what way these suggestions could be incorporated in the Rules of Procedure. There is nothing wrong in giving some more time for discussion.

*Sri V. M. MASCARENHAS.—If for three years and a half the House has not bothered its head about the Rules of Procedure, it was not the folly of the Special Committee. Everybody

(SRI V. M. MASCARENHAS.)

has admitted that the amendments suggested by the Committee are of distinct improvement over the old rules. If that is the case, I do not understand why any further improvements are needed. We must work with the rules that are presented to us. If at a later date, we feel that there is need for further revision of rules, we have got ample scope for amending them. My personal opinion in the matter is that these rules can be accepted by the House as they stand at present. If at a later stage any amendments are needed we can certainly think of considering them.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—The Special Committee constituted for the purpose of suggesting some amendments to the existing rules has presented its report recently. If the Committee has not presented its report for all these three years, it is not the mistake of this House. The Special Committee has taken that time to go into the question of amending the rules and has presented a report. Many of the recommendations made are quite welcome. We do not want to lose these valuable suggestions. But certain suggestions need amendments. There is nothing wrong if we press that the same Special Committee might consider the views expressed by the members of this House. We can have the benefit of that report straightaway. I do not think there is any wrong in transmitting this report to the Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think it has been retransmitted to the same committee once or twice.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—There are also some retrograde suggestions also made in this report, Sir. As pointed out by Sri Srinivasa Iyengar and Sri V. M. Mascarenhas there is a definite improvement in some of the clauses. Though there are definite improvements yet there are some restrictions imposed, especially, in the case of allowing a question or disallowing a question. Four or five more clauses have been added under which several questions can easily be disallowed. Some

of those restrictions have to be removed. It is not as though the suggestions made are all definite improvements over the existing rules. Therefore I feel that it is better that some more time is allowed for its discussion, and the members desiring to table amendments could also be permitted to do so. These things may have to be considered dispassionately.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—If the Hon'ble Members want to discuss this subject tomorrow also, I think they may be given some time. The amendments that would be suggested by the members could also be considered. Such of the recommendations which have been accepted unanimously by the House could be accepted. With regard to the amendments, another motion will have to be made to the effect that the rules may be referred to the Committee that may be reconstituted. The other recommendations which are not acceptable to the House, may be transferred to the Rules Committee for further consideration.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY (Mysore City—South).—The procedure of the Special Committee is prescribed under Rule 185 (2). It says :—

“ 185 (2) After the Special Committee presents its report to the Assembly, the Assembly shall dispose of the matter in the same manner as reports of a Select Committee on Bills under these rules subject to such variations as the Speaker may direct.”

It is for the Hon'ble Speaker to kindly suggest the variations. The amendments that would be tabled by the members will have to be moved and referred to the Special Committee. It is for the Speaker to kindly suggest the method. This procedure comes under Rule 185 (2) of the Rules of Procedure. That is the special procedure prescribed there.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is true. On the first page of the Report of the Special Committee, it is stated thus :—

“ Certain amendments have been suggested in the Report of the

Special Committee on the Rules of Procedure presented to the House on the 13th of July 1953. As the Special Committee which made that report is identical with the present Committee, we have re-examined the amendments suggested in that report and have incorporated almost all of them. This has been done with a view to avoid duplication of work and to enable members to have one report before them which will contain all the amendments considered necessary."

Therefore the amendments which were referred to the Committee by this House were considered and an unanimous report was submitted. Now if there are further amendments, and if you want them to be referred back to the same Committee on a motion, it would not be appropriate. That is what I feel. The committee has to be reconstituted for considering the further amendments that would be made here. If we do so, the very advantages for which we were fighting till now, will not effectively come into force. In view of the fact that the Special Committee has conferred upon the members certain effective privileges, I will leave it to the Hon'ble Members to decide whether to adopt them or to send them back again. The Committee has definitely improved upon the mode of sending short notice questions.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—That question may be taken up tomorrow, Sir. In the meanwhile, the members may be allowed to send in their amendments. The Special Committee will have to be reconstituted. Such of the recommendations which are acceptable by the House might be accepted and such of the recommendations which may not be accepted might be referred back to the reconstituted Committee for further consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now half an hour debate on question No. 350 by Sri M. Madiah.

L.A.

Half-hour Debate on Question No. 350 re: Taluk and District Depressed Classes Amelioration Advisory Committees.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಮಾದಯ್ಯ (ನಂಜನಗೂಡು—ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿಗಳು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು 1954 ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿ ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ 24 ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಪ್ರೆಸ್ಡ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಎಮಿಲಿಯೇಷನ್ ಆಫ್ ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಿದರು. ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಪ್ರೆಸ್ಡ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸಿನವರ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಅಗತ್ಯವಾದಂಥ ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ರಚಿಸುವಾಗ ಅನೇಕ ಕಡೆಗಳಿಂದ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರು. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಪ್ರೆಸ್ಡ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸಿನ ಪಾಲಿಸಿ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ನಾಲ್ಕಾರು ಸಲ ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಈ ಡಿಪ್ರೆಸ್ಡ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸಿನವರ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಬಹಳ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತ ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ; ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಟೆಪರ್ ಅಟೇಪ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯವೆಂದು ನಮೂದಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಸಮಿತಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸ್ತ್ರೀಮೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಯವರೆಗೂ 82 ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಇದ್ದುವು. ಬೆಳ್ಳಾರಿಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದಮೇಲೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಏಳು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳೂ ಸೇರಿಕೊಂಡು ಈಗ ಒಟ್ಟು 89-90 ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಈ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಡಿಪ್ರೆಸ್ಡ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸಿನವರ ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲೂ 9 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಒಂಭತ್ತು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಪೈಕಿ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಂತೆ ಡಿಪ್ರೆಸ್ಡ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳಿರಬೇಕೆಂದೂ, ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಅಮಲ್ದಾರರು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದೆಂದೂ, ಆಯಾ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೂ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದೂ, ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನ ಡಿಪ್ರೆಸ್ಡ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೋಗುತ್ತ ಇನ್ನುಳಿದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಈ ಡಿಪ್ರೆಸ್ಡ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸಿನವರ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಸಕ್ತರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅಂಥ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನ ಖಾಸಗೀ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ 1954 ನೆಯ ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನೇಮಕವಾದಂಥ ಸಮಿತಿಗಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾದಂಥ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಗಳನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದನಂತರ ಆ ಮೊದಲಿದ್ದ ಎಮಿಲಿಯೇಷನ್ ಆಫ್ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಎನಾದರೂ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂತೇ, ಏನಾಯಿತು ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯಾವ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ದೃಢವಾಗಿ ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ರದ್ದುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣಗಳೇನೆಂಬುದನ್ನೇ ತಿಳಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಇಷ್ಟು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಶಾಭಾಸಗಿರಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದರಂತೆ ಅವರ ಕೆಲಸ ಬಹಳ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿತ್ತೆಂದು ರಿಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಸಹ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆಪ್ತು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಆಗಸ್ಟ್ 24 ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದ ಆರ್ಡರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದಿದ್ದ ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಅದಾಲಪ್ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆನ್ನೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ.